

REMARKS

Claims 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Applicant amended claims 19 and 20 to include a business class storage unit. Since the storage unit provides hardware support and is not software *per se*, withdrawal of the §101 rejection of claims 19 and 20 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Struts, the Jarkarta Project, Apache Software Foundation, 2000-2001 (hereinafter, "Struts"). Applicant traverses the rejection based on these amendments and for the reasons recited below.

Regarding independent claims 1, 16, and 19, Applicant traverses the rejection.

In Struts, the form HTML tag includes information about a java class to be associated with the tag (see Struts, pages 72-73). However, the form tag represents HTML data, and not XML data. Thus, in Struts, the java class corresponds to an HTML tag and not XML data. While Struts does parse an XML file, there is no teaching or suggestion of any correspondence between the XML parser and the HTML form tag (page 43, first full paragraph). Accordingly, Struts fails to disclose that a business class corresponds to a tag in the XML data, as recited in claims 1, 16, and 19.

Moreover, Struts does not disclose a business class manager in which items of the business classes, which are classes before compilation and to be created, are registered. The Examiner indicates that the element matching patterns on page 43

of Struts correspond to the business class manager of the present invention. The element matching patterns are used to match nested XML tags encountered in an document being parsed (page 43, first full paragraph). However, the element matching patterns of Struts do not teach or suggest that items of a business class are registered.

Additionally, the Examiner indicates, that a user's session in Struts corresponds to the business class manager as recited in the claims. However, Applicant asserts that the business class manager is actually very different from the user's session. A user's session is typically limited to both a particular user and a particular time frame, the business class manager. Thus, because the user's session does not correspond to the business class manager, Struts fails to disclose registering an item of the business class in the business class manager, as recited in claims 1, 16, and 19.

Finally, the Examiner is inconsistent in the characterization of the prior art reference. As indicated above, the Examiner states that the element matching patterns of Struts correspond to the business class manager recited in the present claims (see paper no. 10800122-111907, page 5, lns. 14-19). The Examiner also asserts that the user's session of Struts corresponds to the business class manager of the present claims (see page 5, line 20 – page 6, line 4). However, the processing rule represented by the element matching patterns is very different from the user's session. Thus, Applicant does not believe the business class manager recited in the present claims can correspond to both the element matching patterns and the user session.

For all of these reasons, Applicant asserts that independent claims 1, 16, and 19, together with their respective dependent claims, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to independent claims 7, 17, and 20, the arguments above traversing Struts are reasserted. Applicant further traverses the rejection because Struts does not disclose generating template source program data for the specified business class.

In Struts, if no session scope bean is available, a new one is created and added to the user's session. However, Applicant submits that the session scope bean that is added to the user's session is an executable program and not template source program data, as recited in claims 7, 17, and 20. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to independent claims 7, 17, and 20.

Regarding independent claims 8, 18, and 21, Applicant traverses the rejection because Struts fails to disclose that XML data is inputted or selected for a form screen by a user operating an apparatus that displays the form screen.

Struts is silent regarding a user operating an apparatus to input or select data on a form screen. In fact, Struts teaches that the Digester parser parses XML documents automatically, with no developer attention (see page 43, first full paragraph). Thus Applicant submits that Struts does not teach that data is inputted or selected for the form screen by a user who operated an apparatus that displayed the form screen. Accordingly, Struts also cannot disclose executing a business class by using the data inputted or selected for the form screen by the user.

Moreover, as discussed above, Struts does not disclose a business class corresponding to a tag in the XML data. In Struts, a form HTML tag includes information about a java class to be associated with the tag. However, the form tag represents HTML data, and not XML data. Thus, in Struts, the java class corresponds to an HTML tag and not XML data. Accordingly, Struts fails to disclose that a business class corresponds to a tag in the XML data, as recited in claims 8, 18, and 21. For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 8, 18, and 21, and their respective dependent claims.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Kevin T. Bastuba

Registration No. 59,905

April 25, 2008
300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978